



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,547	11/28/2001	Esa Jalonen	4208-4045	9335
27123 7590 10/30/2007 MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101			EXAMINER TRUONG, LAN DAI T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOPatentCommunications@Morganfinnegan.com
Shopkins@Morganfinnegan.com
jmedina@Morganfinnegan.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/995,547

Applicant(s)

JALONEN ET AL.

Examiner

Lan-Dai Thi Truong

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 January 1934.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/11/2007.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is response to communications: filed on 11/28/2001; amendment filed 08/09/2007. Claims 1-34 are pending; claims 1-2, 6-8, 11-15, 17-22, 24, 27-30 are amended

2. Applicant's arguments filed 08/09/2007 have been fully considered. But Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The previous Office Action is retained.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 5, 12, 14 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Baginwar (U.S. 6,611,863) in view of Lakshman et al. (U.S. 6,341,130)

Claims 2, 4, 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Baginwar-Lakshman in view of Duvall et al. (U.S. 5,884,033)

Claims 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Baginwar-Lakshman in view of Krumel et al. (U.S. 7,013,482)

Claims 7, 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Baginwar (U.S. 6,611,863) in view of Haggerty et al. (U.S. 6,331,983)

Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Baginwar-Haggerty in view of Duvall et al. (U.S. 5,884,033)

Claims 9 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Baginwar- Haggerty in view of Krumel et al. (U.S. 7,013,482)

Claims 21-23, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Baginwar-Lakshman in view of Wootton et al. (U.S. 6,128,298)

Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Baginwar-Lakshman-Wootton in view of Haggerty et al. (U.S. 6,331,983)

Claims 18, 29 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Haggerty et al. (U.S. 6,331,983) in view of Wootton et al. (U.S. 6,128,298)

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Krumel et al. (U.S. 7,013,482) in view of Wootton et al. (U.S. 6,128,298)

Claims 19-20, 28, 30 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Duvall et al. (U.S. 5,884,033) in view of Wootton et al. (U.S. 6,128,298)

4. The rationale of the rejections previously presented in the last Office Action is hereby incorporated in the previous rejections under USC § 103 for the case is retained. Please see the previous rejections sent out on (04/09/2007) for details

Claims Objections

Claims 1, 7, 12, 15, 18-19, 21, 24, 27-30 are objected to as being missing brief description of nature and intended use of article in which the design is embodied, see 37 CFR 1.154 (b)(1)

Response to arguments

5. Regarding applicant's argument to claim 1 with respect to the combination of references (Banginwar and Lakshman) does not teach feature of: "examining a connection from a client machine; retrieving a filter parameter for the connection" are not persuasive; Banginwar clearly teaches method of examining and discovering device connection protocol in the network in order to identify device type with its associated filter (abstract; column 4, lines 16-27). In Banginwar's system, a filter is retrieved from a group of registered filters accordance to device type/ or communication protocol (column 4, lines 59-65; column 3, lines 21-29, 55-67)

6. Regarding applicant's argument to claims 12 and 15 with respect to the combination of references (Banginwar and Lakshman) does not teach feature of: "examining a message from a client machine; retrieving a filter parameter for the connection to the client machine" are not persuasive; the office interprets a message from a client machine could be a connection request message from a client machine; and examining a message could be interpreted as examining the connection request message to find out protocol type for the connection request message. Banginwar clearly teaches method of examining connection protocol in order to identify what type of device for retrieving associated filter attributes of that device, see (abstract; column 4, lines 16-27, 59-65; column 3, lines 21-29, 55-67)

7. In response to applicant's arguments with respect to if the policies are for connections; Banginwar clearly teaches the associations of policies/filters with connection protocols (abstract; column 4, lines 16-27, 59-65; column 3, lines 21-29, 55-67)

8. Regarding applicant's arguments to claim 7 with respect to the combination of references do not disclose feature of: "determining a connection the filter is associate with" are

not persuasive; Banginwar clearly teaches the associations of policies/filters with connection protocols (abstract; column 4, lines 16-27, 59-65; column 3, lines 21-29, 55-67)

9. Regarding applicant's arguments to claim 21 with respect to the combination of references do not disclose feature of: "detecting a multicast data connection; associating the data connection with a filter parameter; fetching the filter parameter" are not persuasive; Banginwar clearly teaches method of examining connection protocol in order to identify what type of device for retrieving associate filter attributes for that device from groups of registered filters, see (abstract; column 4, lines 16-27, 59-65; column 3, lines 21-29, 55-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to know that the filter attributes (filter parameter as claimed) should be fetched for process of associate connection protocols with filter attributes.

10. Regarding applicant's arguments to claim 24 with respect to the combination of references do not disclose feature of: "detecting a data connection being closed; associating the data connection with a filter parameter; fetching the filter parameter" are not persuasive; the features of "associating the data connection with a filter parameter; fetching the filter parameter" clearly taught by Banginwar, see section 9) for details. While the feature of: "detecting a data connection being closed" is taught by Haggerty ex: removing filter in response to detect of leaving message/ loss connection (connection being close as claimed), see (Haggerty: column 20, lines 32-33; column 22, lines 55-67; column 24, lines 1-16, 34-55; column 29, lines 39-67; column 30, lines 1-67; column 31, lines 1-29; column 33, lines 6-11)

11. Regarding applicant's arguments to claim 18 with respect to the combination of references does not disclose feature of: "removing a filter based on a filter parameter associated with the entry in the table that corresponds to the IGMP message having the instruction to leave

a multicast group” as not persuasive; Haggerty discloses method for removing filter in response to upmap message/ leave message from IGMP switch: column 24, lines 11-16, 34-55; column 29, lines 39-67; column 30, lines 1-67; column 31, lines 1-29; column 33, lines 6-11; column 21, lines 11-42;)

12. Regarding applicant’s arguments to claim 29 with respect to the combination of references does not disclose feature of: “removing a filter for SIT corresponds to the IGMP packet having the instruction to end a subscription” as not persuasive; without providing the definition for the term “subscription,” the office interprets the term subscription means upmap message/ or closed connection. Haggerty discloses method for removing filter in response to upmap message/ leave message from IGMP switch: column 24, lines 11-16, 34-55; column 29, lines 39-67; column 30, lines 1-67; column 31, lines 1-29; column 33, lines 6-11; column 21, lines 11-42)

13. Regarding applicant’s arguments to claim 27 with respect to the combination of references does not disclose feature of: “activating a filter based on the filter parameter” are not persuasive. Refer to the specification, [0009], the phase “activating a filter” means as retrieving filter parameter and sending the filter parameter for connection; Krumel discloses a firewall system receives a packet from one of numbers of communication links connected to the firewall system. The received packet then analyzed based on those conditions i.e. packet characteristics, datagram boundaries, receiving port...etc to determine the type of packet in order to retrieve associate filter criteria for that communication link: column 4, lines 35-65; column 5, lines 29-45; column 7, lines 1-52)

14. Regarding applicant's arguments to claim 28 with respect to the combination of references does not disclose feature of: "... identifying an SIT entry having an active status as the filter status; removing a data filter corresponding to a filter parameter of the identified SIT entry" are not persuasive; Wootton clearly discloses identifying the statuses for sessions connection conditions from a translate table; and Wootto also teaches removing an entry from the translate table if that entry is not matched with any entry from a lookup table , see (column 6, lines 15-50; column 5, lines 7-67; column 4, lines 1-67; column 6, lines 42-67; figure 5)

15. Regarding applicant's arguments to claims 19 and 30 with respect to the combination of references does not disclose feature of: "...determining the filter parameter of second type of entry that is present in the SIT and not present in the UDP listener table; removing a filter that contains a filter parameter corresponding to an SIT entry which is no UDP entry associated..." are not persuasive; There is no definition for the term "second type of entry" demonstrated from the specification. The Office interprets second type of entry as table entry. Refer to the specification, [0021]-[0022], an entry of UDP listener table binds to a port number of coming packet, and SIT used to tracks port number, filter parameter for identified packet. Wootton clearly teach IP filter uses port number of received packet to index the lookup table (which shares functionality with UDP listener table as claimed) (column 3, lines 10-11, 32-41; column 4, lines 31-44). Also Wootton includes a translation table (which shares functionality with SIT as claimed). Each entry from index the lookup table is associated/matched with entries in the translation table if any unmatched entry found it'll be deleted from the translation table (column 6, lines 15-50). Moreover Duvall also teaches method for associating/interacting between "the internal table and filter database" those shares functionality with SIT/and UDP listener table as

Art Unit: 2152

claimed in order to update new entries into filtering database see (title, column 3, lines 40-67; column 4, lines 1-67; column 5, lines 7-29; column 6, lines 42-67; figure 5)

16. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "a first table...second table....associate first table with second table") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993)

Moreover, even if this feature was in the claim it also can be read from Wootton (U.S. 6,128,298). Wootton clearly teach IP filter uses port number of received packet to index the lookup table (which shares functionality with first table) (column 3, lines 10-11, 32-41; column 4, lines 31-44). Also Wootton includes a translation table (which shares functionality with second table). Each entry from index the lookup table is associated/matched with entries in the translation table if any unmatched entry found it'll be deleted from the translation table (column 6, lines 15-50)

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2152

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lan-Dai Thi Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-7959. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday from 8:30am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob A. Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

10/25/2007



JEFFREY PWU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER